



"Menschenverbesserung durch Bombenterror"

Dr. Tomislav Sunic

www.tomsunic.com

Dresden ist nur ein einziges Symbol des alliierten Verbrechens, ein Symbol - das ungern von heutigen Systempolitikern erwähnt wird. Die Zerstörung Dresdens und seine Opferzahl sind stets in der Systemhistoriographie relativiert und als Kollateralschaden im Kampf gegen das absolute Böse, bzw. den Faschismus geschildert. Das Problem besteht jedoch in der Tatsache, dass es nicht nur die Weltverbesserungskollateralschaden in der Stadt Dresdens gab, sondern auch in anderen Dresdens in allen Ecken Deutschlands, in allen Teilen Europas. Die Topographie des Todes, die von den damaligen Antifaschisten verursacht wurde, ist ein sehr problematisches Anliegen für ihre Nachfahren.

Im heutigen „Weltwettkampf um die historische Erinnerung“ haben nicht alle Opfer das gleiche Recht alle gleich zu sein. Manche Opferlehren müssen Vorrang haben, und manche sollen total in Vergessenheit

geraten. Unsere Systempolitiker sind sehr eifrig, wenn es darum geht, Denkmäler für Völker und Stämme zu errichten, besonders für jene die zu Opfern der Europäer wurden. Immer mehr Gedenktage, immer mehr Wiedergutmachungstage vermerken unseren Wandkalender. Immer wieder zollen die europäischen und amerikanischen Systempolitiker finanziellen Tribut an nichteuropäische Opfer. Selten, fast nie, gedenken sie der Opfer ihrer eigenen Völker, die untern den sogenannten kommunistischen und liberalistischen Weltverbessern gelitten haben. Als böse Tätervölker gelten immer die Europäer, besonders die Deutschen, die daher stets zu Bußritualen genötigt werden.

Dresden ist nicht nur eine deutsche Stadt, oder das Sinnbild eines deutschen Schicksals. Dresden ist auch das allgemeine Sinnbild von zahllosen deutschen und zahllosen europäischen, bzw. kroatischen, ungarischen,

italienischen, belgischen und französischen Städten, die von den Westalliierten entweder bombardiert oder gar zerbombt worden waren. Was mich mit Dresden verbindet, verbindet mich mit Lisieux, einem kleinem Pilgerort in Frankreich, der von den Alliierten im Juni 1944 zerbombt war, oder auch mit dem italienischen Pilgerort Monte Cassino, welcher ebenso im Februar 1944 von den Alliierten zerbombt wurde. In Lisieux, einer Kleinstadt - die der Heiligen Theresa gewidmet wurde, wurden am 10. Juni 1944, 1200 Leute verbrannt, das Benedikt Kloster wurde auch total verbrannt, darinnen 20 Ordensfrauen. Eine Liste der zerbombten europäischen Kulturstädte hier anzuführen, würde eine ganze Bibliothek erfordern -- vorausgesetzt, dass diese Bibliothek nicht einmal wieder von den Menschenverbesserern zerbombt würde. Vorausgesetzt, dass die Bücher und die Dokumente drinnen

nicht mal beschlagnahmt werden. In Frankreich, während des Zweiten Weltkrieges starben ca 70.000 Zivilisten unter den angloamerikanischen demokratischen Bomben, die Zahl die ungen von den Systemhistorikern erwähnt wird. 600.000 Tonnen Bomben wurden auf Frankreich von 1941 bis 1944 abgeworfen, 90.000 Gebäude und Häuser zerstört. Die heutigen Systempolitiker benutzen heute häufig das Wort Kultur und Multikultur. Aber deren kriegerische Vorgänger haben sich besonders durch die Zerstörung der verschieden europäischen Kulturdenkmäler ausgezeichnet. Deswegen mussten die europäischen Kirchen und die Museen zerstört werden, da diese Orte dort unten in Dresden nicht der Kategorie von Kulturmenschen hineinpassten. Weiter südlich, im Wien wurde im März 1945 das Burgtheater von den amerikanischen Luftbomben gebombt; weiter westlich in Norditalien wurde auch das Opernhaus 'La Scala' in Milano bombardiert, so wie hunderte von Bibliotheken überall in Mitteleuropa. Weiter südöstlich in Kroatien wurden Kulturstädte Zadar und Split in 1944 von den westlichen Menschenverbesserern gebombt und dieses Horrorpanorama hat kein Ende. Die deutschen Politiker und deutsche Touristen machen oft Urlaub an der kroatischen Küste, aber der Küste entlang gibt es zahlreiche Massengräber deutscher Landsen. Auf der kroatischen Insel Rab, wo die deutschen Nudisten gerne Spaß haben, gibt es ein riesiges Massengrab mit den Knochen mehreren Tausend Deutschen, die von der Jugo- Kommunisten ermordet wurden. Die deutschen Diplomaten in Kroatien haben gar nichts getan um die

Denkmäler für diese gemarterten Soldaten zu errichten. Vor kurzem hat die demokratische Wertegemeinschaft eine große Sorge um die ethnische Säuberung in ehemaligem Jugoslawien zur Schau gestellt und sich eifrig bemüht die jugoslawischen und die serbischen Täter vor Gericht in den Haag zu bringen. Aber diese jugoslawischen Täter hatten perfekte Vorbilder in ihren jugo-kommunistischen Vorgängern und ihren angloamerikanischen Verbündeten. Ende 1944, Anfang 1945 gab es eine massive kommunistische ethnische Säuberung an den Volksdeutschen aus dem jugoslawischen kommunistischen Raum. Im Mai 1945 haben sich hunderttausende flüchtende Kroaten, meistens Zivilisten an die angloamerikanischen Alliierten in Südkärnten, Klagenfurt, in Südösterreich ergeben. In den folgenden Tagen wurden sie alle an die Jugo-kommunistischen Schergen ausgeliefert. Über die Millionen vertriebenen Deutsche aus Schlesien, Pommern, aus dem Sudetenland und Donauraum kann ich jetzt stundelang reden. Da diese Opfer in die Kategorie der kommunistischen Gewalttäter fallen, werde ich sie nicht den demokratischen und westlichen Menschenverbesserern momentan zurechnen. Im Rückblick sehen wir jedoch, dass die westlichen Weltverbesserer nie ihre Menschenverbesserungsprojekte hätten erfüllen können - ohne die Beihilfe der kommunistischen Schergen, auch der sogenannten Antifaschisten. Klar, die größte deutsche und nicht nur deutsche Völkerwanderung in europäischer Geschichte aus Mittel und Osteuropa geht auf

das Konto der Kommunisten und der Roten Armee, aber nie hätte dieses gigantische kommunistische Völkerverbrechen gegen die deutschen und andere europäischen Völker stattfinden können - ohne die massive Lufthilfe der westlichen Menschenverbesserer. Also, es gelten immer noch zweierlei Maßstäbe, wenn wir der Toten des Zweiten Weltkrieges gedenken. Was ging den Menschenverbesserern durch den Kopf während der Zerstörung europäischer Städte? Diese demokratischen Piloten hatten alle ein perfektes und gutes Gewissen; sie dachten wahrlich, dass sie eine gottausgewählte Mission durchzuführen hatten. Ihre Zerstörungsmission wurde in dem Namen der Menschenrechte und Toleranz und Weltfrieden geführt. Ihrer messianischen Gesinnung nach, lebten da unten in Mitteleuropa - ganz zu schweigen von hier unten in Dresden, keine Menschen sondern eine besondere Abart der Monster ohne Kultur. Demzufolge, um ihrem demokratischen Dogma treu zu bleiben, hatten diese Luftsamariter immer ein gutes Gewissen um die Monster hier unten zu zerbomben. Wie uns der große deutsche Staatsrechtler Carl Schmitt lehrte, liegt hier eine gefährliche Problematik mit dem modernen Völkerrecht und der Ideologie der Menschenrechte vor. Sobald man seinen militärischen Gegner als Monster oder als Ungeziefer beschreibt sollen die Menschenrechte für diesen Gegner bzw. diesen Monster und dieses Ungeziefer keine Gesetze mehr gelten. Das ist der Hauptbestand des heutigen Systems. Gleichfalls, sobald ein europäischer Intellektuelle,

Akademiker oder Journalist, kritisch die heutigen Systemmythen anzweifelt, begeht er das Risiko als Rechtsradikal oder als Faschist, bzw. als Unmensch gekennzeichnet zu sein. Folglich kann dieser Rechtsradikal oder Faschist, bzw. dieser Unmensch nie mehr ein Mensch sein; dann hilft ihm gesetzlich keine Ideologie der Menschenrechte. Er wird ausgegrenzt und beruflich mundtot gemacht. Das System prahlt heute mit seiner Toleranz gegenüber allen Menschen und allen Völkern der Erde, jedoch nicht gegenüber jenen die vorerst als als Rechtsradikale bzw. Unmenschen etikettiert werden. In den Augen der Menschenverbesserer waren die deutschen Zivilisten hier auf diesem Platz im Februar 1945 keine Menschen - sondern eine ganz besondere Art des Ungeziefers das man zusammen mit ihren Gehäusen auslöschen sollte. Wir finden solche Gesinnungen auch heute bei den Weltverbesserern, besonders in ihrem militärischen Einsatz in Irak, oder Afghanistan. Man wirft uns vor, die Dresdener Opferlehre hochzuspielen um die faschistischen Verbrechen zu relativieren. Das ist Unsinn. Diese These kann leicht umgekehrt werden. Die Systemmedien und die Meinungsmacher brauchen, 70 Jahre nach dem Kriege, immer wieder die faschistische Gefahr um damit ihre eigenen katastrophalen wirtschaftlichen Fehler und ihre eigene Kriegsverbrechen besser zu verbergen, vertuschen und verschleiern.

Darüber hinaus wollen die Systemhistoriker und die Meinungsmacher uns nicht sagen dass jede Opferlehre in heutigem Multikultisystem konfliktstiftend ist: jede Opferlehre beharrt auf ihrer eigenen Einzigartigkeit und beruht immer auf den Kosten der Anderen. Hier sieht man die Schwäche des Multikultisystems – letztendlich führt es zur Balkanisierung, zum Bürgerkrieg und dem Zusammenbruch des Systems. Ein Beispiel: Die heutige viktimologische Atmosphäre in heutigem Multikultisystem verleitet jeden Stamm, jede Gemeinschaft, jeden nicht-europäischen Zuwanderer zu der Annahme, nur seine Opferlehre sei wichtig und einzigartig. Das ist ein gefährliches Phänomen, da jede Einzigartigkeit die andere Opferlehre diskriminiert und mit den anderen Opferlehren im Wettbewerb steht und letztendlich zusammenstößt. Solche Opferrollenmentalität dient nicht der Konfliktverhinderung und dem Frieden. Sie führt zur multiethnischen Gewalt und macht den künftigen Konflikt unausweichlich. Mit heutiger Verharmlosung und Relativierung der liberal-kommunistischen Verbrechen gegen das deutsche Volk, vor, während und nach dem Zweiten Krieg, entsteht kein Klima gegenseitigen Verständnisses und der Versöhnung, sondern ein Klima der falschen Mythologien und kollidierenden Opferlehren, wobei sich jeder Mensch, und jeder Stamm als Opfer seines jeweiligen Nachbars fühlen muss.

Das Schulbeispiel ist wieder der Zusammenbruch des ehemaligen Kunststaates Jugoslawien, wo verschiedene Völkerschaften fünfzig Jahre hindurch die Opfer der kommunistischen Historiker und Propaganda waren und wo das kroatische Volk stets als Nazivolk dämonisiert wurde. In 1991, nach dem Ende des Kommunismus, nach dem Ende der kommunistischen Propaganda, die Folge war nicht ein gegenseitiges Verständnis der Völker, sondern gegenseitiger Hass und furchtbarer Krieg wo sich alle Seiten gegenseitig als Faschisten beschimpften. Was uns bald in der EU erwartet ist keine exotische multikulturelle Spaßgesellschaft, sondern ein ähnlicher balkanischer Zyklus der Gewalt und Bürgerkriege. Geben wir uns - liebe Kollegen und Kameraden - keinen Illusionen hin. Dresden ist ein verdienter Mahnort gegen alle Kriege, und der Ort wo wir der unschuldigen Opfer gedenken. Aber Dresden kann morgen zum Sinnbild für titanische Katastrophen sein. Was uns in den folgenden Jahren erwartet kann man sich schon jetzt vorstellen. Manche von euch, manche von uns, die ein verlängertes Geschichtsbewusstsein haben, wissen gut, dass eine Welt seit langem zu Ende ist. Das liberale Zeitalter ist seit langem tot. Die heranrückenden Zeiten werden schlimm sein. Aber die kommenden und die heranrückenden Zeiten bieten uns allen auch eine Chance.

The Occidental Observer — Dresden: Death from Above

Tom Sunic, February 20, 2013

What follows below is the English translation of my speech in German which I was scheduled to deliver on February 13, 2013, around 7:00 PM in downtown Dresden. The commemoration of the Dresden February 13, 1945 victims was organized by "[Aktionsbündnis gegen das Vergessen](#)" (action committee against oblivion), NPD deputies and officials from the [local state assembly](#) in Dresden. There were 3,000 leftist antifa demonstrators. The city was under siege, cordoned off into sections by 4,000 riot policemen. The bulk of the nationalist participants, approximately 1,000, who had previously arrived at the central station, were split up and prevented from joining with our group at the original place of gathering. Toward 11:00 PM, when the event was practically over, the riot police did allow our small group of organizers and speakers to march past the barricades down to the central station. There were approximately 40 of us—mostly local NPD officials. On February 14, while still in Dresden, I provided more information as a guest on the Deanna Spingola's RBN radio show: [Hour 1](#), [Hour 2](#).

Police separate groups of right-wing and left-wing demonstrators outside Dresden's central train station.

Human Improvement by Terror Bombardment

Dresden is only one single symbol of the Allied crime, a symbol unwillingly discussed by establishment politicians. The destruction of Dresden and its casualties are trivialized in the mainstream historiography and depicted as "collateral damage in the fight against the absolute evil — fascism." The problem, however, lies in the fact that there was not just one bombing of one Dresden, but also many bombings of countless other Dresdens in all corners of Germany and in all parts of Europe. The topography of death, marked by the antifascists, is a very

problematic issue for their descendants, indeed.

In today's "struggle for historical memory," not all victims are entitled to the same rights. Some victimhoods must be first on the list, whereas others are slated for oblivion. Our establishment politicians are up in arms when it comes to erecting monuments to peoples and tribes, especially those who were once the victims of the Europeans. An increasing number of commemoration days, an increasing number of financial compensation days show up in our wall calendars. Over and over again European and American establishment politicians pay tribute to non-European victims. Rarely, almost never, do they commemorate the victims of their own peoples who suffered under communist and liberal world improvers. Europeans and especially Germans are viewed as evil perpetrators, who are therefore obliged to perpetual atonement rituals.

Dresden is not only a German city, or the symbol of a German destiny. Dresden is also the universal symbol of countless German and countless European, Croatian, Hungarian, Italian, Belgian and French cities that were bombed by the Western Allies, or for that matter that were fully bombed out. What connects me to Dresden connects me also to Lisieux, a place of pilgrimage in France, bombed by the Allies in June 1944; also to Monte Cassino, an Italian place of pilgrimage, bombed by the Allies in February 1944. On 10 June 1944, at Lisieux, a small town that had been dedicated to Saint Theresa, 1,200 people were killed, the Benedictine monastery was completely burnt out, with 20 nuns therein. To enumerate a list of the bombed-out European cultural cities would require an entire library — provided that this library would not be again bombed out by the world improvers. Provided that the books and the documents inside are not confiscated.

In France, during the Second World War, about 70,000 civilians [found death](#) under the Anglo-American democratic bombs, the figure reluctantly mentioned by establishment historians. From 1941 to 1944, 600,000 tons of bombs were dropped on France; 90,000 buildings and houses were destroyed.

The establishment politicians often use the word "culture" and "multi-culture." But their military predecessors distinguished themselves in the destruction of different European cultural sites. European churches and museums had to be destroyed, in view of the fact that these places could not be ascribed to the category of human culture. Further south, in Vienna, in March 1945, the Burgtheater was hit by the American bombers; further to the West in northern Italy, the opera house La Scala in Milan was bombed, as were hundreds of libraries throughout Central Europe. Further south in Croatia the ancient cities of Zadar and Split were bombed in 1944 by the Western world improvers and this panorama of horror knew no end. The Croatian culture town Zadar, on the Adriatic coast, was bombed by the Allies in 1943 and 1944. German politicians and German tourists often make holiday on the Croatian coast; yet along the coast there are many mass graves of German soldiers. On the Croatian island of Rab, where the German nudists like to have fun, there is a [huge mass grave](#) containing the bones of hundreds of Germans who were murdered by the Yugo-communists. German diplomats in Croatia have shown no effort to build monuments for those martyred soldiers.

Recently, the so called democratic community put on display a big concern about the ethnic cleansing and the destruction in the former Yugoslavia. It was also quite busy in bringing the Yugoslav and Serbian perpetrators to justice at the Hague tribunal. But those

Serbian and Yugoslav perpetrators had already had a perfect role model in Communist predecessors and in their Anglo-American allies. By the late 1944 and early 1945, there were massive ethnic cleansings of Germans in the Yugoslav communist areas. In May 1945, hundreds of thousands of fleeing Croats, mostly civilians, surrendered to the English Allied authorities near Klagenfurt, in southern Carinthia, only to be [handed over](#) in the following days to the Yugoslav Communist thugs. I could talk for hours about the [millions of displaced Germans](#) from Silesia, Pomerania, the Sudetenland and the Danube region. In view of the fact that those victims do not fall into the category of communist perpetrators, for the time being I'm not going to ascribe them to the Western world improvers. In hindsight, though, we can observe that the Western world improvers would have never been able to complete their world improvement job without the aid of the Communist thugs, the so-called anti-fascists. Clearly, the largest mass migration in European history, from Central and Eastern Europe, was the [work of the Communists and the Red Army](#), but never would have their gigantic crimes against the German civilians and other Central European nations taken place without deliberate help of the Western world improvers. Well, we are still dealing with double standards when commemorating the WWII dead. What was crossing the minds of those world improvers during the bombing raids of European cities? Those democratic pilots had good conscience because they sincerely felt that they had to carry out a God-ordained democratic mission. Their missions of destruction were conducted in the name of human rights, tolerance and world peace. Pursuant to their messianic attitudes, down under and below in Central Europe — not to mention

down here in Dresden — lived no human beings, but a peculiar variety of monsters without culture. Accordingly, in order to remain faithful to their democratic dogma, those airborne Samaritans had always good conscience to bomb out the monsters below.

As the great German scholar of international law, Carl Schmitt, taught us, there is a dangerous problem with modern international law and the ideology of human rights. As soon as one declares his military opponent a "monster" or "an insect," human rights cease to apply to him. This is the main component of the modern System. Likewise, as soon as some European intellectual, or an academic, or a journalist critically voices doubts about the myths of the System, he runs the risk of being branded as a "rightwing radical," "a fascist," or "a monster." As a monster he is no longer human, and cannot be therefore legally entitled to protection from the ideology of human rights. He is ostracized and professionally shut up. The System boasts today about its tolerance toward all people and all the nations on Earth, but not toward those that are initially labeled as monsters or right-wing extremists, or fundamentalists. In the eyes of the world improvers the German civilians standing on this spot in February 1945, were not humans, but a bizarre type of insect that needed to be annihilated along with their material culture. Such a mindset we encounter today among world do-gooders, especially in their military engagement in Iraq or Afghanistan.

We are often criticized for playing up the Dresden victims in order to trivialize the fascist crimes. This is nonsense. This thesis can be easily reversed. The establishment historians and opinion-makers, 70 years after the war, are in need of forever renewing the fascist danger in order to cover up their own catastrophic economic failures and their own war crimes.

Moreover, establishment historians do not wish to tell us that that each victimhood in the multicultural System is conflict prone; each victimhood harps on its own uniqueness and thrives at the expense of other victimhoods. This only points to the weakness of the multicultural System, ultimately leading up to the balkanization, civil war and the collapse of the System. An example: The current victimological atmosphere in today's multicultural System prompts every tribe, every community, and every non-European immigrant to believe that only his victimhood is important and unique. This is a dangerous phenomenon because each victimhood stands in the competition with the victimhood of the Other. Such victimhood mentality is not conducive to peace. It leads to multiethnic violence and makes future conflict inevitable.

With today's trivialization and denial of the liberal-communist crimes against the German people, inflicted before, during, and after the Second World War, there can be no climate of mutual understanding and reconciliation, but only an atmosphere of false myths and conflicting victimhoods, whereby each person and each tribe conceives of himself as a victim of his respective neighbor.

The classic example is again the collapse of the former state of Yugoslavia, an artificial state in which for fifty years different peoples were the victims of Communist historians and propaganda, with the Croatian people being demonized as a "Nazi nation." In 1991, after the end of communism, the result was not mutual interethnic understanding, but mutual hatred and a terrible war in which each side called the other "fascist." What awaits us soon here in the EU, is not some exotic and multicultural utopia, but a balkanesque cycle of violence and civil wars.

Dear ladies and gentlemen, dear friends. Let us not fall prey to

illusions. Dresden must serve as a warning sign against all wars, as well as a place for commemorating the innocent victims. But Dresden can become tomorrow a symbol of titanic catastrophes. What awaits us in the coming years, one can already imagine. Some of you, some of us, with a longer historical memory, know well that a world

has come to an end. The age of liberalism has been dead for a long time. The incoming times will be bad. But these incoming and approaching times offer us all a chance.

Dr. Tom Sunic
www.tomsunic.com is former professor of political science and a [Board member](#) of the

American Freedom Party – formerly American Third Position Party. He is the author of [Homo americanus: Child of the Postmodern Age](#) 2007.

<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2013/02/dresdendead-from-above/#more18012>

Travel Writer Booted Off a United Airlines Flight for Taking a Picture of His Seat

DL Cade • Feb 21, 2013

[Matthew Klint](#) is an avid travel writer and loyal United Airlines flyer who spends almost as much time in the air as he does on the ground. Last year alone he traveled more than 200,000 miles, and his contributions can be found in the *Washington Times*, *USA Today*, *BBC*, *Toronto Star*, and his *Live and Let's Fly* blog.

But last week, Klint recorded an airline first for him on what was supposed to be a flight from Newark to Istanbul: he was kicked off of the flight for taking a photo of the seat in front of him, and then explaining why it was he had taken the picture.

The story goes something like this. Sitting in a 767-300 and having just been upgraded to business class, Klint pulled out his iPhone and snapped the following picture of the display on the seat in front of him. He was immediately approached by a flight attendant, told he was not allowed to take pictures, and

pointed towards United's "Onboard Photo and Video" guidelines in *Hemisphere* magazine:

He quickly and without argument put his phone away and complied with instructions as the flight attendant rushed off to reprimand another flyer that was doing the same thing. But the whole interaction had bothered him, so he got her attention in order to explain his side and clear up any misunderstandings:

Naturally, the FA's warning bothered me and I felt the need to explain myself. I signaled for her to come back and asked her to hang my coat. I then said this verbatim— 'I want you to understand why I was taking pictures. I hope you didn't think I was a terrorist. Here is my business card [offering her one]. I write about United Airlines on an almost-daily basis and the folks at United in Chicago are even aware of my blog.'

[She] refused to take my business card saying, 'No, that's okay,' then

saying, 'I did not know that' after I explained my reason for taking pictures. I again emphasize, I took no more pictures.

That's when things got ugly. A few minutes later, he was asked by a Global Services rep to disembark and find another flight to Istanbul at the pilot's behest. After several minutes of confusion and a less-than-polite interaction with the pilot, during which Klint realized that the flight attendant had lied to the pilot, he got off the plane and found another connecting flight.

The whole altercation has led to a lengthy write-up on his well-trafficked blog, which will inevitably translate into some bad press for United — and all because he took a photo of the seat in front of him.

For all of the details — including the full dialogue between Klint, the pilot and the GS rep — you can [read the entire story](#) over on Klint's blog - <http://www.petapixel.com/2013/02/21/travel-writer-gets-booted-off-of-united-flight-for-taking-a-picture-of-his-seat/>.

Analysis on Israel, Palestine, and the American connection. I am not the British historian. Please stop threatening her.

More on the Gilad Atzmon controversy – and why it matters...

Alison Weir - <http://alisonweir.org/> Friday, February 1, 2013 at 01:09PM

I'd rather be researching and writing [articles](#) on Palestine-Israel; analyzing [media coverage](#); placing [advertisements and billboards](#) around the country; creating fact-sheets, cards, booklets and other [materials](#) on the topic; updating the websites (e.g. [here](#) and [here](#) and [here](#)) we've created to get the facts out; creating [new initiatives](#);

and numerous other productive activities for justice and peace.

However, I feel I need to briefly take time out to provide information about the Gilad Atzmon controversy, since I feel the attacks on him are enormously unfair, they continue to occasionally interfere with productive efforts, are sometimes used to try to block my presentations (more on this later), and

because an important new article on the topic has just come out.

[Gilad Atzmon](#), an Israeli who moved to London about 20 years ago, is a superb jazz musician who has written several books, and [blogs](#) about Israel-Palestine. His most recent book, and the center of the controversy, is [The Wandering Who: A Study of Jewish Identity Politics](#), in which he draws on his background in

philosophy (he has a Masters degree in the subject) to explore the Jewish connection to the Jewish state.

Some activists found this topic impermissible and began to launch attacks on Atzmon, which largely seemed geared at preventing others from reading his work for themselves.

In February 2012 a public [letter](#) denouncing him was launched with 33 signatories, none of them Palestinian. (One signatory, listed first, is Lebanese; the full list is below).

The letter was circulated widely and [reposted](#) various places; eventually accruing 173 names. This time a handful were Palestinian.

(At least one prominent US activist, not Palestinian, didn't sign the letter publicly, but privately attempts to block Atzmon's events in the US.)

In March a second public letter denouncing Atzmon was published – this one with a particularly defamatory headline and somewhat militaristic terminology: "[Granting No Quarter: A Call for the Disavowal of the Racism and Antisemitism of Gilad Atzmon.](#)"

It contained a grand total of 23 signatories. All were Palestinian, most of them living in the US.

Some of the individuals who signed these letters later admitted they had never read Atzmon's book. (In fact, given how busy we all are, I would guess few of them did.)

Many others – including both Palestinian and Jewish activists, authors, and scholars – refused to sign such letters. Prominent author and scholar [Ghada Karmi](#) wrote that she opposed the attacks on Atzmon.

In fact, many prominent and widely respected individuals – such as Richard Falk, Mazin Qumsiyeh, Ramzy Baroud, Lauren Booth, David Rovics, Sameh Habeeb, Sheldon Richman, Nahida Izzat, and Cynthia McKinney – found Atzmon's work valuable. (See more [here](#).)

I myself wrote a mild [commentary](#) saying that I respected people on both sides of the controversy but came down on the side of free speech and against "thought police." I also posted a [commentary](#) by another person.

Because of this, some [solidarity activists](#) now openly attack Richard Falk and others because of their stand on Atzmon, and there are apparently a few who attack me because of my comments.

One person emailed the sponsors of one of my talks in London, falsifying what Atzmon says and I had written, in an

attempt to persuade the organizers to cancel the event.

Other individuals, endeavoring to block my talks and prevent *If Americans Knew* tables at conferences and events, have claimed that I tried "to tell Palestinians what to do" because I had commented on this controversy, even though 23 signatories hardly represents all Palestinians, and even though many other Palestinians also disagreed with the letter these individuals had signed.

Now there is a new development. An individual named Blake Alcott has written a thorough analysis of Atzmon's writings and of the attacks against him, published on [CounterPunch](#) and [Redress](#). (I will also post it below; to see the footnotes, some of which contain additional valuable information, read it either on Redress or on [Alcott's site](#)). As Redress Editor Nureddin Sabir writes:

"Blake Alcott debunks the 'anti-Semitism' slur levelled at musician and writer Gilad Atzmon by US academic Ali Abunimah, and explains that Atzmon 'illuminates the 'pro-Semitic' racist ideology fatal to Palestinians'."

To reiterate what I wrote in my first post on this controversy:

I respect and like people on both sides of this controversy, including a number of people who signed the letters attacking Atzmon.

Even though I disagree with the decision some made to sign these letters, I still feel we are allies in an urgent cause and hope we will continue to work together to bring the change that is so desperately needed. Let us set aside attacks on Atzmon and others, let us not let others exploit this issue to block presentations by those who differ on this issue, and let us turn our full focus, time, and efforts to our life-and-death struggle against the continued oppression of millions of men, women, and children in Palestine and beyond.

#

Below is Alcott's [article](#) from CounterPunch. To read it with footnotes included go to [Alcott's site](#).

To Shun or Bury the Hatchet?

The Case of Gilad Atzmon

by BLAKE ALCOTT

Panel at Cooper Union NYC led by Anne-Marie Slaughter, 28 September 2006:

Tony Judt: I just... I'd just like to say one very quick thing about [the difficulty of getting anything critical of Israel into the mainstream media]. When I submitted an article about the Israeli Lobby debate – that Mearsheimer and Walt kicked off – to a very well known American, North American, newspaper

[NY Times], I was asked by the editorial directors would I mind telling them whether I'm Jewish or not. They felt it was something they would like to know before they published it.

Martin Indyk: But they published it.

TJ: I told them I was Jewish. (Audience laughs.)

This review of Gilad Atzmon's book ***The Wandering Who? A Study of Jewish Identity Politics*** and the anti-Atzmon essay by Ali Abunimah and some 20 co-signatories called *Granting No Quarter: A Call for the Disavowal of the Racism and Antisemitism of Gilad Atzmon* is an effort to unite the movement for one secular, democratic state (ODS) in historic Palestine of which both Atzmon and Abunimah are adherents. Edward Said wrote,

The absence of a collective end to which all are committed has crippled Palestinian efforts not just in the official realm, but even among private associations, where personality conflicts, outright fights, and disgraceful backbiting hamper our every step.

In his last years Said put such a "collective end" into words – for coexistence between Jews and Arabs in one state – and now, at the end of a decade that has witnessed outstanding articles, books and conferences articulating this vision, a chasm opens up. If our effort is not to be crippled both sides must bury the hatchet.

Abunimah, Omar Barghouti, Rafeef Ziadah and other signatories, as well as other ODS supporters known to me who have disavowed Atzmon, have made enormous contributions to justice for Palestinians. Their accusations are worth examining, which requires examining *The Wandering Who?* and some of Atzmon's blogs and videos with an eye out for the racism, 'antisemitism' and Holocaust denial of which *Granting* accuses him. I haven't read everything, of course, and there are certainly mistakes in my judgment, so I welcome any feedback and debate.

The call for disavowal accuses Atzmon of 5 trespasses:

- 1. He claims to speak for Palestinians.**
- 2. He denies that Zionism is settler-colonialist.**
- 3. He believes that to self-identify as a Jew is to be a Zionist.**
- 4. He denies the Holocaust.**
- 5. He is an 'antisemite', a racist.**

Two general observations: First, *Granting's* accusations are formulated indirectly, not 'in so many words'; but a reading of the short document shows

that these are what it boils down to. Second, *Granting* itself does not include any proof or evidence for the accusations; there are no examinations of Atzmon's texts, even out of context. Neither are there explicit definitions of the terms 'racist' and 'antisemitic' that would by rights accompany such severe accusations. For such more detailed definitions and arguments I have searched the web in vain, but of course the web is large, and if I have missed something I hope somebody tells me. I'm restricting my analysis almost entirely to *Wandering* on the assumption that evidence for the accusations would be there, if anywhere.

Strictly speaking there is thus no case, only claims. Atzmon is innocent till proven guilty. It is unfair, difficult and inefficient to put the burden of proof on the accused. Nevertheless, I've read the book carefully and ended up writing a defense of it that includes several criticisms, quoting Atzmon at length along the way. Please *also* see the favourable reviews by Mazin Qumsiyeh and John Mearsheimer, and a less favourable one by Elias Davidson. I ignore denunciations of Atzmon by Alan Dershowitz, Tony Greenstein and Jeffrey Goldberg because they consist of associative thinking and are based on often-unreferenced quotations out of context. Preceding *Granting*, in late February 2012, was a similar critique of *Wandering* that actually contains 12 quotations from Atzmon.

The five accusations

1. Guiding the Palestinian struggle

Granting claims that Atzmon "for many years now... has taken on the self-appointed task of defining for the Palestinian movement the nature of our struggle, and the philosophy underpinning it." Since I am sure the *Granting* signatories do not reject all ideas of all outsiders, this leaves it unclear what counts as acceptable opinion and support. It is moreover legitimate for Atzmon and other Israeli citizens to advocate visions of the future of their country – necessarily including Palestinians.

Granting's concern becomes clearer through the further statement that "As Palestinians, it is our collective responsibility, whether we are in Palestine or in exile, to assert our guidance of our grassroots liberation struggle." Atzmon has in fact elsewhere agreed with this:

It is our duty (as human beings) to show our support to the Palestinian people but we are not allowed to tell

them what to do. We are not allowed to tell them what is right or wrong, we can only offer ourselves as soldiers...

Ignoring the absurdity of the idea of 'telling Palestinians what to do', roles between the oppressed and those in solidarity with them must always be negotiated. In this case however I know that there is almost total agreement between Atzmon and the "principles" of the movement guided by the signatories: Right of Return, equality not apartheid within Israel, liberation of the West Bank and Gaza, and perhaps even a preference for one over two states.

2. Settler-colonialism

Granting claims that "Zionism, to Atzmon, is not a settler-colonial project..." The text of *Wandering* does not support this claim. Atzmon in several places explicitly affirms that Zionism is settler-colonial. (pp 9, 88, 101, 165) In apparent contradiction, he does in one place write that it "is not a colonial movement with an interest in Palestine". (p 19) In my reading this means it is not just a run-of-the-mill colonial movement out for economic or geopolitical gain: there is no mother country unless it is world Jewry, and Zionism's only colony is Palestine, which was chosen over Argentina and Uganda for cultural and/or religious reasons. Atzmon elsewhere objects to the "misleading" colonialism paradigm because he regards Zionism as a unique racist project, not motivated by material exploitation for the (non-existent) homeland.

Atzmon is basically asserting that the settler-colonialist paradigm is not *sufficient* to explain Zionism: Zionist events like the attack on the Mavi Marmara, dropping White Phosphorus on Gaza, slicing up the Holy Land with separation walls, and indeed the original expulsion of "the vast majority of the Palestinian indigenous population just three years after the liberation of Auschwitz... have nothing to do with the colonialist nature of the Jewish state..." (pp 181-182) To be sure, the term "nothing" overstates the case, but his claim is that *more than* colonialism is involved. I'm inclined to agree when I read for instance Netanyahu's December 2012 statement that "We live in a Jewish state, and Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. The Western Wall is not occupied territory. We will build in Jerusalem because this is our right."

3. Jewish political identity

Granting interprets Atzmon's complex sociological concept of Jewish-ness to mean that

Zionism...is...part and parcel of defining one's self as a Jew. Therefore, he claims, one cannot self-describe as a Jew and also do work in solidarity with Palestine, because to identify as a Jew is to be a Zionist.

Now, to say that self-identifying as a Jew entails Zionism is *prima facie* absurd, and I do not find the claim in *Wandering*. I agree with *Granting* that Atzmon is wrong in his blanket criticism of anti-Zionist Jewish groups. I also find Atzmon at places abstruse on this issue of the relation between world Jewry, "Jewish ideology" and Zionism.

But confusion is abated when we realise that his definition of Zionism differs from the standard, broad 'movement for a Jewish state in Palestine'. Rather: "I suggest that it makes far more sense to regard Zionism as a tribal Jewish preservation project [aiming at] the prevention of assimilation..." Accordingly, Zionism should be seen as an amalgam of different philosophies specialising in different forms of tribal separatism, disengagement and segregation." (p 70) Atzmon is thus talking only about a *political* self-identity, so *Granting* misrepresents him. Atzmon sets up three non-exclusive basic categories: "Jews (the people), Judaism (the religion) and Jewish-ness (the ideology)... or identity politics, or political discourse". (p 15) The book does not criticise Jews, the first category, does criticise a few aspects of Judaism, the second, and argues for 200 pages against the third, Jewish-ness, and against those who "put their Jewish-ness over and above all of their other traits." (p 16)

I am confused as to whether Atzmon wants to say that *politically* identifying with Jewish-ness entails Zionism. In numerous places criticises or laughs at Jewish tribalism (pp 19, 32, 56, 113, 116, 164-165, 172, 181-184), writing that "to identify politically as a Jew and to wonder what is 'good for the Jews' is the true essence of Jewish *tribal thinking*..." (p 184) Zionism "united the tribe on many levels" (p 46) and "is grounded on a very specific realisation of the Jewish identity as a synthesis of racial awareness, religious awareness and nationalistic awareness". But while Jewish-ness is an ethnically-based political ideology, Atzmon doesn't show that non-Zionist Jewish political identities are inconceivable.

Granting's signatories must have misread the sentence, "To be a Zionist means to accept that, more than anything else, one is primarily a Jew."

(p 19) This says that all Zionists are 3rd-category Jews, not the reverse. The context moreover is a specific discussion of *sanayim*, Mossad agents living abroad.

I do however fault Atzmon's statement that "...considering the racist, expansionist Judeo-centric nature of the Jewish State, the Diaspora Jew finds himself or herself intrinsically associated with a bigoted, ethnocentric ideology and an endless list of crimes against humanity." (p 48) What does "intrinsically" associated mean? Merely being "associated" (by others) with something bad is one thing; but when this is "intrinsic" it could mean that the bad thing is indeed "part and parcel" of being a Diaspora Jew.

4. Holocaust denial

Atzmon throughout acknowledges the Holocaust, *shoah* or Judeocide, asserting however that it should be studied historically like other ethnic exterminations. (pp 43, 70, 130-131, 154, 175-176, 182, 185-186) And we need to see how the Holocaust is used in the destruction of the Palestinians – a position shared by Yeshayahu Leibowitz, Adi Ophir, Norman Finkelstein and Marc Ellis. (pp 148-152, 162) I do find imprecision in his statement that the "Holocaust... [is] not an historical narrative, for historical narratives do not need the protection of the law and politicians" (p149); to be consistent with everything he writes about the Holocaust this should read "not *merely* an historical narrative".

Atzmon recalls,

As much as I was a sceptic youngster, I was also horrified by the Holocaust. In the 1970s Holocaust survivors were part of our social landscape. They were our neighbours, we met them in our family gatherings, in the classroom, in politics, in the corner shop. They were part of our lives. The dark numbers tattooed on their white arms never faded away. It always had a chilling effect. Yet I must mention that I can hardly recall a single Holocaust survivor who ever attempted to manipulate me emotionally." (pp 185-186)

Further, "It is the Holocaust that eventually made me a devoted supporter of Palestinian rights, resistance and the Palestinian right of return." (p 186)

An earlier blog reads,

[T]he form of Holocaust denial that really bothers me is the denial of the on-going Palestinian Holocaust. This Holocaust is documented and covered daily by the western media. The turning

of residential Palestinian cities into concentration camps; the deliberate starvation of the Palestinian population; the withholding of medical aid from Palestinian civilians; the wall that tears the holy land into isolated cantons and Bantustans; the continuous bombardment of civilians by the IAF are known to us all. This Holocaust is committed by the Jewish state with the support of world Jewry.

This accusation by *Granting* is absurd.

5. Racism and 'antisemitism'

Atzmon writes nothing against Jews by origin, i.e. against anybody based on their genetic heritage or 'race'; yet this would be the precondition for justifying the allegation of 'antisemitism'/racism because 'semitic' refers to an *ethnos* or race. I trust moreover that 'some of his best friends are Jewish', and he vows:

I will present a harsh criticism of Jewish politics and identity. Yet... there will not be a single reference to Jews as ethnicity or race... This book doesn't deal with Jews as a people or ethnicity. If anything, my studies of the issue suggest that Jews do not form any kind of racial continuum...[] I also refrain from criticising Judaism. Instead, I confront different interpretations of the Judaic code. I deal with Jewish Ideology, Jewish identity politics, and the Jewish political discourse. I ask what being a Jew entails. (p 15; *also* pp 147-148) Again, his first two categories – religious Jews and Jews by origin – are "harmless and innocent". (p 16) No one is calling for harm to Jews. (p 131)

Atzmon does once lambaste Judaism for tribalism because it so closely adheres to an ethnic rather than religious concept of itself (p 113) and sees a continuum between the Bible and Zionism (pp 120-122). But he says clearly,

I am against racism and in fact in my writing you won't find a single racial reference. Moreover, when I write about Jewish identity I analyse it in ideological and philosophical terms. For me Jewishness is a mind set. Nothing to do with the quality of one's blood or the religion of one's mother.

He does unfortunately make several statements that refer to "Jews" where "Jewish-ness" or "Zionist" would be more accurate and consistent with the whole book. He for instance writes of "European and American Jews" who have assimilated and cast aside their "Jewish identity", where he means their Jewish *political* identity or identification with the "tribe". (pp 64-65) He rightly says that all Jewish Zionists sign up to

the Jewish-ness ideology, but he should avoid any ambiguity suggesting that all Jews adhere to Jewish-ness.

Blurring occurs when he omits the qualifier 'political' in writing of "the Jew within", "the Jewish understanding of the past" or occasionally of "Jewish identity". (pp 95, 173, 135) He does however usually precisely include it, for example in writing that one "can hardly endorse a universal philosophy while being identified politically as a Jew." (p 39; *also* pp 102, 138, 145, 174) Imprecision burdens as well the statement that "Jewish people... can never be like 'other people', for those who demand to be seen as equal must feel inherently and categorically different." (p 52) I also miss clear definitions for the phrases "the Jewish condition" (p 184) and "the wider Jewish problem". (p 15)

Atzmon's use of the phrase "Jewish lobbyists" (pp 152, 171) has been challenged, clarity speaking for "Israel lobby" or "Zionist lobby". It is however at least mitigating that most Jewish Zionist lobbyists *themselves* refer to themselves and their organisations as 'Jewish', and that Zionists themselves appropriate Jewish identities to oppress Palestinian Arabs – for instance with the Holocaust (pp 130-134) or Judaic symbols on fighter planes (p 140). As Zionist Michael Bar-Zohar puts it, "If you're attacking Israel, this means you are attacking Jews." But why should one language-rule be valid for *pro*-Israel lobbies and another for its critics? (pp 149-151)

Granting in addition accuses Atzmon of "allying" himself with "conspiracy theories, far-right, orientalist, and racist arguments, associations and entities", but offers no evidence, nor even a definition of what "allying" would look like. I urge Atzmon to make his language less ambiguous, but given that he is criticising what he sees as the dominant Jewish *political* culture, not Jews in general, his book in fact supports *Granting's* position that "our struggle was never, and will never be, with Jews, or Judaism, no matter how much Zionism insists that our enemies are the Jews. Rather, our struggle is with Zionism."

Anti-Jewish-ness

Benny Morris, in an interview with *Jewish Chronicle* and *Guardian* Zionist Jonathan Freedland, defends himself against Freedland's suggestion that his critical, negative claims about Arab culture "could be seen as" racist by rejoining that he [like Atzmon] is

speaking of a dominant political culture, not Arabs as a genetically defined ethnic group. Morris's ambiguities are between statements that 'all Arabs' or 'a majority of Arabs' or 'Arabs' or 'Arab culture(s)' place relatively low value on human life, but it seems the generalising nature of sociological analysis always entails a degree of conflation between (1) the dominant norms of the group and (2) all members of the group. Nietzsche walked the same tightrope in his *Kulturkritik* of Christianity. But the issue is the quality of Morris's or Atzmon's or Nietzsche's empirical evidence and cultural analysis – a well-known academic field – not whether any such investigation is racist. It is not, since there is no appeal to ethnic causality which is the criterion for both positive (e.g. 'philosemitic') and negative (e.g. 'antisemitic') racism. The advertisement for *Wandering* claims: "Since Israel defines itself openly as the 'Jewish State', we should ask what the notions of 'Judaism', 'Jewishness', 'Jewish culture' and 'Jewish ideology' stand for." The Jewish state and its behaviour is an *explicandum* of the first order, costing as it does Palestinian lives and livelihoods. He quotes Israel's first president: "'There are no English, French, German or American Jews, but only Jews living in England, France, Germany or America.'" In just a few words, Weizmann managed to categorically define the essence of Jewish-ness." (p 16) With this concept he hopes to correct and add to our understanding of Zionism.

Atzmon told *Ha'aretz*:

The Israelis can put an end to the conflict in two fucking minutes. Netanyahu gets up tomorrow morning, returns to the Palestinians the lands that belong to them, their fields and houses, and that's it. The refugees will come home and the Jews will also finally be liberated: They will be free in their country and will be able to be like all the nations, get on with their lives and even salvage the bad reputation they have brought on themselves in the past 2,000 years. But for Netanyahu and the Israelis to do that, they have to undergo de-Judaization and accept the fact that they are like all peoples and are not the chosen people. So, in my analysis this is not a political, sociopolitical or socioeconomic issue but something basic that has to do with Jewish identity. The anti-Zionist as well as the pro-Zionist discourse cannot be separated from the Jewish discourse.

At a One Democratic State conference in Stuttgart in 2010, attended by both

Atzmon and Abunimah, the latter argued that this 'culture' category is useless:

I think that to use language that blames a particular culture – [Atzmon] was talking about Jewish culture – is wrong [applause] because such arguments could be made about anyone. We could blame German culture for the history of Germany, we could blame British culture for the history of British imperialism, we could blame Afrikaner culture for apartheid in South Africa. And this really doesn't explain anything at all. (emphasis added)

Atzmon counters that this is what historians, sociologists, anthropologists, intellectuals are doing when they try to understand historical and political development. The historians and sociologists who look into the Nazi era, don't they look into German culture, into German philosophy, into the work of Wagner, both as a writer and as a composer, into the work of Hegel, and the German spirit, into Christian antisemitism, and the impact of the Protestant church, don't they look into a Martin Luther, and his infamous book about the Jews and their lives? Don't they look into German Early Romanticism? We are in the 21st century. We understand very well that culture, politics, history, heritage, religions, are all bonded together. Abunimah's position is of course untenable, while at the same time it remains to be seen whether Atzmon's concept of 'Jewish-ness' really earns its keep.

Perhaps "Jewish-ness" is not strictly necessary to refute Zionism and support ODS. However, on the principle of 'know thine enemy' it may assist us in fighting Zionism and negotiating with Israel – were it ever to come to the table. I moreover submit that analysing the hoary topic of 'what it is to be a Jew' is of much interest to many Jews who are now doubting their support of the Jewish state. It seems to me that the issue can contribute to both an intra-Jewish discussion and to the discussion of how to stop the Jewish state's murderous ethnic cleansing. Why should it do only one or the other?

One Granting signatory, Omar Barghouti, has sought in terms similar to Atzmon's to explain Zionist crimes against Palestinians, the "relative-humanization" of Palestinians, and how Zionists live with it. His explanatory concept is 'Jewish fundamentalism', relying partly on the thought of Israel Shahak to find cold-bloodedness and

justification for Jewish ethnic superiority in some "tenets of Jewish Law". The Midianite genocide and certain Torah passages provide precedents for what is happening today. Atzmon likewise relates Israeli behaviour to Biblical precedents (pp 120-122, 157-162), yet in the main looks at secular Jewish culture, whereas Barghouti is perhaps focusing only on religious Jewish culture. Or, if it is not Atzmon's anti-Jewish-ness that Barghouti finds racist, antisemitic and Holocaust-denying, what is it?

As for the *content* of Jewish-ness – in the broadest terms merely "Judeo-centric political discourse" (pp 88, 55, 145, 197) – Atzmon characterises it as (1) exclusivist, (2) based on the uniqueness of Jewish suffering, (3) supremacist and (4) uncannily paralleling some Old Testament stories. (pp 121, 160, 188) He writes for instance that

assimilation has never been presented as a Jewish political call. It was rather individual Jews who welcomed and enjoyed European liberal tendencies. The Jewish political call was inspired by different means of tribal, cultural or even racially-orientated segregation. (p 32)

As evidence that it is more "tribal" than many other groups Atzmon points to a relatively high resistance to assimilation, strong *halachic* marriage rules (procreative isolation), and high hurdles for conversion to Judaism. (pp 19, 32, 56, 113, 116, 164-165, 172) The bridge to Zionism, in Atzmon's view, seems to be that a combination of exile, cohesion and chosenness, together with feelings of unique suffering, led to both a strong desire for an ethnically-defined rather than secular-democratic state and a sense of righteousness (and thoroughness) in its establishment at the expense of indigenous people.

I don't know much about either Judaism or Jewishness, but I think Atzmon's evidence for the trait of supremacy is inadequate. (see pp 2, 101, 181-182) True, Zionist acts are racially supremacist, but the book does not give a rigorous proof that feelings of ethnic superiority inhere in the Jewish *political* culture. But this is a question of content; *that* he writes about it is certainly *kosher*.

We should perhaps not forget that Hess, Jabotinsky, Weizmann and all Israeli politicians have tied the state as closely as possible to Jewish history and culture. (pp 16-17, 139) The Law of Return, the Jewish National Fund, Jews-only settlements and roads, the very

concept of Eretz Israel, and Israel's Declaration of Independence are racist. Negative *Kulturkritik* is not.

Atzmon unexpectedly even has a good word for Jewish-ness in seeing its "complexity" and the "duality of tribalism and universalism... at the very heart of the collective secular Jewish identity..." (pp 148, 162, 56) "Secular collective Jewish identity" is made up of both elements, "Athens" and "Jerusalem". (pp 56, 57, 78) In conciliatory mode he ambivalently asserts that while there is no such thing as a "Jewish humanist heritage"... there are some remote patches of humanism in Jewish culture, [which however] are certainly far from being universal." (p 113) By reference to the ethnic particularism of Jewish-ness he suggests an answer to the question "How is it that... *Israel and its lobbies* are so blind to any form of ethical or universal thinking?" (p 177, *emphasis added*) Another writer seeking connection between "Jewish resources" and a universal, egalitarian ethics is Judith Butler, whose new book ***Parting Ways: Jewishness and the Critique of Zionism*** promises a rewarding look at this topic which should be debated, not silenced by the charge of 'antisemitism' or denying the legitimacy of cultural explanations in principle.

Imagine an exam question: "Is the following statement antisemitic?: The reopening of the tunnel [beneath al-Haram al-Sharif] seems... an act of arrogant triumphalism, a sort of rubbing of Palestinian and Muslim noses in the dirt. This had the added effect of pouring fuel on the smoldering sectarian competition that has been the city's long-standing bane. I do not think there is any doubt that this Lukud assertion of what is unmistakably *Jewish* power over Muslim holy places was intended to show the world... that Judaism can do what it wants.

Atzmon speaks of "Jewish nationalism, Jewish lobbying and Jewish power" (p 145), interpreted perhaps by *Granting* with the somewhat vague phrase "attacking Jewish identities". But cannot one speak of a political ideology that *sees itself* as Jewish using the term 'Jewish' with its bundle of ethnic, religious, and political meanings?

Taboos

Atzmon asks several taboo questions.

I think that 65 years after the liberation of Auschwitz, we must be entitled to start asking questions... We should strip the Holocaust of its Judeo-centric exceptional status and treat it as an

historical chapter that belongs to a certain time and place. The Holocaust, like every other historical narrative, must be analysed properly... Why were the Jews hated? Why did European people stand up against their neighbours? Why are the Jews hated in the Middle East, surely they had a chance to open a new page in their troubled history? If they genuinely planned to do so, as the early Zionists claimed, why did they fail? (pp 175-176) People who place such questions out of bounds "are doomed to think that anti-Semitism is an 'irrational social phenomenon that 'erupts out of nowhere'. Accordingly they must believe that the *Goyim* are potentially mad." (p 182) It is a matter of simple logic that to ask why Jews were hated in Europe is not to presuppose that there were *good* reasons.

Another excerpt:

It took me many years to understand that the Holocaust, the core belief of the contemporary Jewish faith, was not at all an historical narrative [for] historical narratives do not need the protection of the law and political lobbies. It took me years to grasp that my great-grandmother wasn't made into a 'soap' or a 'lampshade' as I was taught in Israel. She probably perished of exhaustion, typhus or maybe even by mass shooting... The fate of my great-grandmother was not so different from hundreds of thousands of German civilians who died in deliberate, indiscriminate bombing, just because they were Germans. Similarly, people in Hiroshima died just because they were Japanese... [As devastating as it was], at a certain moment in time, a horrible chapter was given an exceptional *meta-historical* status. (pp 175, 149)

The "Holocaust religion" freezes a certain narrative in law while Holocaust research follows normal historiographic rules; the claim of its uniqueness is 'philosemitic', and its severity is used to justify, with the logic of two wrongs' making a right, the ethnic cleansing of people having nothing to do with the Holocaust. (pp 148-153)

Evil questions came naturally to Atzmon:

[At age 14 he] asked the emotional tour guide if she could explain the fact that so many Europeans loathed the Jews so much and in so many places at once. I was thrown out of school for a week. (p 184)

"As long as we fail to ask questions, we will be subjected to Zionist lobbies and

their plots. We will continue killing in the name of Jewish suffering." (p 176)

Ben White has similarly asked, "Is it possible to understand the rise in anti-semitism?" This requires defining both 'antisemitic' and 'understand'. One poll question asked people if they "can understand very well that some people are unpleasant towards Jews". While White is not anti-Semitic and not unpleasant towards Jews, he "can... understand why some are." First, Israel subscribes to the racial supremacy of Jews, and Zionists "equate their colonial project with Judaism", and although reacting to this racism and injustice with "attacks on Jews or Jewish property [is] misguided", it can be understood politically. Second, since the Western media are overwhelmingly pro-Israel, some people believe, again "misguidedly", the idea of a "Jewish conspiracy". We must live with the ambiguity of the word 'understand'.

Similarly, when Atzmon calls violence against non-combatants who are Jewish by origin "rational", we must acknowledge the ambiguity of the term 'rational', which doesn't mean 'morally justified'. Atzmon defends his statement that burning down a synagogue can be "a rational act" by explaining that by "rational" he means that "any form of anti-Jewish activity may be seen as political retaliation. This does not make it right." One can ask *why* such violence occurs, just as we can ask *why* the Jewish state commits and condones violence against innocent Palestinians and the destruction of olive trees and water cisterns. It can be Israeli racism, but it could also be 'rational' behaviour for Israel's security. Antisemitism expert Antony Lerman, also, has noted that many acts against Jews in Europe were tied to Israel's unjust behaviour – they were political, not irrational in the sense of arbitrary, or necessarily motivated solely by hate of Jews.

Another hot topic that might can approach solely in terms of Zionism, not Jewish-ness, is that of the economic, political and media power of Zionists who are also Jews in part motivated by allegiance to their ethnic group. Atzmon covers this briefly (169-172), his Exhibit A being the ardently pro-Zionist *Jewish Chronicle's* listing of the relatively large number of Jews in the UK Parliament (all hard or soft Zionists). Exhibit B is billionaire Haim Saban who says, according to a *New Yorker* portrait, "I'm a one-issue guy, and my issue is Israel... [The Arab] terrorists give me a *potch* in the *panim*..." he openly seeks influence

in "political parties,... think tanks... and media outlets...", has tried to buy the *LA Times* and *NY Times* to push his agenda, and "harbors a wariness of Arabs that may stem from growing up as a Jew in Egypt."

To declare out of bounds the subject of Jewish, as opposed to merely Zionist, influence in politics, finance and media is to claim that support for Zionism by many powerful people *has nothing at all to do with* the fact that they are Jewish, or rather, that they politically identify as Jews. Xstrata boss Mick Davis's charity 'United Jewish Israel Appeal' ('Powering young people in the UK and Israel', 'Strengthening Jewish identity and the connection to Israel'), is merely pro-Israel; in spite of its name, its slogans and its activities furthering Judaisation in "the Galil" and the Negev, it has nothing to do with Jewishness, no ethno-cultural content whatsoever. The Anti-Defamation League in the US, on this view, is merely a group protecting Jews from 'antisemitism', only coincidentally pro-Israel. Everybody knows this is fiction, and the subject appears taboo for critics but not for supporters of Zionism.

Again, one can strip Herzl's movement for a *Judenstaat* to its settler-colonialist bones, but given an interest in promoting pro-Palestinian public opinion, one *can* look at this subject soberly, with no 'antisemitic' intent. Whether Jewish-ness and Zionism connect here, and whether this makes any difference in understanding Zionist oppression of Palestinians, are open questions, and I for one look for 'Zionist' rather than 'Jewish' publicists. But why should this be taboo? At any rate, on this subject Atzmon delivers a one-liner: "As I have said earlier, I do not believe in Jewish conspiracies: everything done in the open." (p 76) But his real view is that "In fact the opposite [than a conspiracy] is the case. It isn't a plot and certainly not a conspiracy for it was all in the open. It is actually an accident." (pp 30, 21)

To be avoided is the situation where only supporters of Israel can point to ethnic-ideological connections while critics of Israel cannot. If we want to understand the entity committing the Palestinicide, the only line to be drawn is at hate speech based on ethnic, racial and religious criteria.

My objections

The ambiguity of 'Jewish'

As shown above, some of Atzmon's statements fail to distinguish clearly between his 2nd and 3rd categories –

between Jews by biological origin and those whose priority is their (Jewish) cultural identity – and could thus be *read as* 'antisemitic'. I find however no evidence of hate of, distaste for, or even criticism of, 'Jews'. Complicating judgment of these statements is the fact that when they are 'philosemitic' they are not, in our mainstream discourse, seen as objectionable. (p 51) Not only 'Jewish humour', but quotidian political analysis routinely refers to 'Jewish' – not 'Zionist' or 'Israeli' – identity.

One Israeli analyst for instance correlates Israeli "right" and "left" stances with "where on our scale of identity we place Jewish identity", quoting Netanyahu saying, "The leftists have forgotten what it is to be Jewish." Still, I believe Atzmon should avoid sentences that use the unqualified terms 'Jews' or 'Jewish' when the subject is identity *politics*. The statement "I grasped that Israel and Zionism were just parts of the wider Jewish problem" (p 15) is understood by those familiar with a long intra-Jewish discourse, but not by the wider world. It takes a lot of context to de-fuse a statement like, "With contempt, I am actually elaborating on the Jew in me" – the context coming three paragraphs later, namely that "Jewish-ness isn't at all a racial category..." (pp 94-95)

Tribal supremacy

As already touched on, while the Jewish supremacy of the Jewish state's Zionism is obvious, *Wandering* does not demonstrate to my satisfaction that Jewish-ness is supremacist. Now if Jewish political culture ('Jewish-ness') *is* Zionism, the claim is tautologically true, but Atzmon maintains throughout that they are different. To be sure, adherence to any ethnically- or religiously-defined group arguably implies a belief that the group is a bit better than rival groups: upholding *türklük*, or saying 'I am a Christian' says something about Kurds, and perhaps Islam, as well. But Atzmon's claim is not only open to empirical examination, it is not a claim about (all) Jews as an ethnicity, and therefore not racist. Nevertheless, because this claim is so central to building the bridge between Jewish-ness and Zionism it deserves more argument.

Jews Against Zionism

Atzmon criticises groups that mix ethnic Jewish identity with the non-ethnic political goals of socialism and anti-Zionism; they put their Jewish-ness above the content of their political stance in addition to excluding non-

Jews. (pp 62, 71-76, 86-87, 102-105) Groups such as British Jewish Socialists, Jews for Boycott of Israeli Goods, Jews for Justice for Palestinians, or Jewish Voice for Peace remain, he says, within the discourse of ethnicism rather than universal humanism:

Even saying 'I do not agree with Israel although I am a Jew' is to fall into the trap. Having fallen into the trap, one cannot leave the clan behind – one can hardly endorse a universal philosophy while being identified politically as a Jew. (pp 38-39)

He gives an instance of the conflicting loyalties of Jews who oppose Zionism or support socialism *as Jews* by relating a *Jewish Chronicle* interview with two founding members of British Jewish Socialists who want also to belong to the Jewish ethnic group or nation.

I do differentiate between 'the leftist who happens to be Jewish' – an innocent category inspired by humanism, and 'the Jewish leftist', which seems to me to be a contradiction in terms, for the left aims to universally transcend itself beyond ethnicity, religion or race. Clearly 'Jewish left' is there to maintain a Jewish tribal ethnocentric identity at the heart of working class philosophy. (pp 116-117)

The Marxist European Bund also mixed pro-socialist and pro-Jewish goals (pp 56, 116, 181), but I am not aware of what substantial *differentiae* would set Jewish socialism off from other brands.

It is however Atzmon's attack on Jewish anti-Zionists that prompts the passage in *Granting* stating,

We will not allow a false sense of expediency to drive us into alliance with those who attack, malign, or otherwise attempt to target our political fraternity with all liberation struggles and movements for justice.

Yes, Atzmon targets that part of the pro-Palestinian movement defining itself as 'Jewish', believing that in the long run the cause is best served if we shed our ethnic political identities. He is asking whether, when the message is that "not all Jews are Zionists" (p 102), the main goal is to protect the good name of Jews, to retain some Jewish-ness, or to further the Palestinian cause. I believe Atzmon is here too severe in his critique, firstly because many such Jews fighting for Palestinian rights have impeccable motives, and secondly because there is a gain for Palestinians when a message to world opinion is that criticism of Israel does not entail being against Jews as Jews.

I am not aware that investigations into both 'Jewishness' and 'Jewish ethics' in connection with Zionism have revealed any difference in *content* between 'Jewish' anti-Zionism and ethno-religiously neutral anti-Zionism (i.e. universal ethics). I also accept the common observation that "Anti-Zionist (or Israel-critical) organizing, then, plays a crucial role in establishing a new secular Jewish identity, a field dominated by Zionism in Western nations for decades." But again, the groups often identify themselves as Jewish for public-relations reasons, and indeed, why shouldn't some such activists promote *both* anti-Zionism and the good name of their Jewish ethnos?

The social-marketing desirability of decoupling Jewishness from criticism of Israel, which Atzmon misses or rejects (p 102), is expressed by the group 'Jews for Justice for Palestinians' (which *notabene* supports the two-state solution and is thus not anti-Zionist):

As well as organising to ensure that Jewish opinions critical of Israeli policy are heard in Britain, we extend support to Palestinians trapped in the spiral of violence and repression. We believe that such actions are important in countering antisemitism and the claim that opposition to Israel's destructive policies is itself antisemitic.

While in the long or even medium run it is good to eliminate ethnocentricity from politics, there is perhaps now still some benefit for the Palestinian cause in having explicitly Jewish allies.

Finally, it slanders the many sincere anti-Zionist Jews organised as Jews to claim that they "hate the Goyim" (p 55), that they are (only) there "to keep the debate within the family" (p 102). While I sympathise with Atzmon's attempt to "untangle the knot" (p 15) of religion, ethnicity and Jewish identity politics, and agree we should first and foremost explicitly embrace universal ethics, he here overstates his case. It also seems merely polemical to claim that "when it comes to 'action' against the so-called 'enemies of the Jewish people', Zionists and 'Jewish anti-Zionists' act as one people – because they *are* one people." (p 102) Philosophical analysis of what Zionism has to do with Jewish-ness is still a nascent field, and I urge Atzmon to criticise but not ridicule all organised 'anti-Zionist Jews'.

Alan Greenspan

Atzmon offers a cogent argument that Alan Greenspan's economic policies were disastrous, but asserts that Greenspan, by creating an economic boom, "found

a... way to facilitate or at least divert... attention from the wars perpetrated by the largely Jewish neo-conservatives in Afghanistan and Iraq." (pp 27-30) He however neither offers evidence that Greenspan *intended* the boom to enable the expensive warmongering, nor criticises him for Zionism. He merely calls him a "rich Jew". (p 27) This not only feeds the 'antisemitic' picture of the unscrupulous Jewish money-grubber but is based on Greenspan's being a Jew by origin, not any purported Jewish political identity or culture. I also happen to know that the foreign-policy views of Greenspan are much closer to those of Ron Paul, and that in 1969 he paid for the bail and lawyer of my best friend who had refused to be drafted to go fight in Vietnam. Atzmon's digression on Greenspan is harmful or at least pointless in the battle for justice for Palestinians.

An objection to *Granting*

The anti-colonialist 'self-determination' discourse must today compete with the individual-rights discourse. While Atzmon adheres strictly to the latter and sees the dangers in the self-determination of groups (pp 52, 105-106), *Granting* refers to the Arab-Palestinian "homeland" and the "self-determination... of the Palestinian people" (*emphasis added*); the text speaks of "our native lands". The "our" can refer to those comprising the large majority of those who have lived there during the last dozen-plus centuries and happened to be 'Arabs' or 'Semites' and overwhelmingly Moslem; or it can be ethnicist, meaning Arab Semites, perhaps describing the signatories. Here perhaps we have contrasting visions of the one-state vision broadly shared by Atzmon, Barghouti and Abunimah, the latter seeing the constitution more in terms of bi-nationalism rather than the state's absolute blindness towards ethnicity and religion. Yet why would this would be a reason to "disavow" Atzmon?

The signatories speak of "the struggle for Palestine and its national movement" and of theirs as "the Palestinian movement". They also claim some rights in "defining for the Palestinian movement the nature of our struggle" and "the philosophy underpinning it". Some sectarian as well as secular anti-Zionist Palestinians might disagree with this but, recalling the very first accusation against Atzmon (*above*), the point is that unless one excludes Israeli Jews from voting in the future secular, democratic state, Atzmon can speak not

only universally but for himself as a citizen. I agree that one state is a bigger ask for the Palestinians than for the Israeli Jews, who as colonists are being invited to remain. But even outsiders like myself have the right to support any part of the 'Palestinian movement' we agree with. These questions about homelands and leadership deserve discussion rather than disavowal.

Granting speaks as well of Atzmon's "obsession with 'Jewishness'", but this would surely be only Atzmon's problem. The call moreover characterises Atzmon's "attacks on anyone who disagrees with his [alleged] obsession with 'Jewishness'" as "vicious". However, in *Wandering* he aims no criticism at critics of his concept of Jewish-ness, and while I find sarcasm that occasionally goes too far, "vicious" is a crass mis-characterisation.

Other takes on Jewishness

How does Atzmon's anti-Jewish-ness compare with other types of pro- or anti-Jewishness? Witness a Jewish-critical statement of Meron Benvenisti:

I would say that what characterizes us collectively is ethnic hatred, ethnic recoil, ethnic contempt and ethnic patronizing.

He balances this generalising take on the Jewish "collective" with the caveat that "I would not categorize us all as racists", exactly paralleling Atzmon's distinction between 2nd- and 3rd-category Jews; he attests racism only of a "large segment" of Jewish Israeli society. Benvenisti by the way also makes the statement that he is "proud to be a white *sabra* [native-born Israeli Jew]". Is Benvenisti an anti-Jewish racist, a pro-Jewish one, or neither?

Philo-Jewishness statements likewise may or may not be 'philosemitic'. In a *Guardian* interview Arnold Wesker utters, "A reverence for the power of the intellect is for me a definition of Jewishness:..." Now, a definition has a *genus* and one or more *differentiae*, so what distinguishes "Jewishness" as a type of sociological reification is a reverence for the power of the intellect. The inescapable corollary is that other ethnic (religious? cultural?) groups have no, or less, such reverence. It is perhaps evidence of this purported reverence that a website proudly lists Jewish Nobel laureates.

What are we to make of the observation of one of these Nobel laureates, Saul Bellow, on a trip to Jerusalem, that "a few Arab hens are scratching up dust and pecking"? That "Jewish claims in Jerusalem are legitimate"? That Israelis

have a tough life "all because [they] wished to lead Jewish lives in a Jewish state"? That "When the Jews decided, through Zionism, to 'go political', they didn't know what they were getting into"? That (according to A.B. Yehoshua) "Perhaps there is something exceptional in all our Jewishness [which] to us... is clear and we can feel it..."? That Bellow's one academic colleague who criticised Zionism "went out to jog on a boiling Chicago afternoon and died of heart failure"? Bellow, who believes in "the moral meaning of Israel's existence" and that it "stands for something in Western history", uses ethnic, political and culture concepts interchangeably. Is Bellow an anti-Arab racist, a pro-Jewish one, or neither?

Many Jews-by-origin reject Zionism but retain Jewishness. Paul Knepper writes of Michael Polanyi:

In making the case for a Jewish state as the solution to anti-Semitism, Zionists had thrown up an array of mistaken identities, defining Jewishness in political, religious, and cultural terms. Polanyi rejected this as inward-looking, even reactionary; he pursued an outward-looking understanding based on the relationship of Jews to non-Jews. Polanyi saw assimilated Jews [like himself] not as running away or denying Jewish identity, but instead, as pursuing a truer and more significant expression of Jewishness.

Atzmon agrees with the first sentence but argues against finding identity in what one is not, and abandons the quest for Jewish-ness as such. (pp 31-36, 58-63, *passim*)

Eric Hobsbawm, the unobservant Jew who called himself a "non-Jewish Jew" and "not a Jewish historian [but an] historian who happened to be Jewish" (also Atzmon, pp 16-18), similarly saw a need to retain some "Jewishness", even if it consisted merely of not being ashamed to be Jewish. He said of his friend Isaiah Berlin in contrast, "His Jewish identity implied identity with Israel because he believed that the Jews should be a nation."

I have read only the introduction to Judith Butler's *Parting Ways*, where she outlines the Jewishness of her formation and many of the ethical sources she draws on but acknowledges the paradox – perhaps contradiction – of holding values that are simultaneously universal and Jewish. (pp 26, 18) As the jacket of her book states,

Jewish ethics not only demand a critique of Zionism, but must transcend its exclusive Jewishness in order to realize

the ethical and political ideals of living together in radical democracy.

She is a proponent of one secular, democratic state in Palestine searching for "a different Jewishness... [and] the departure from Jewishness as an exclusionary framework for thinking both ethics and politics." (p 2) Her book promises [recalling Polanyi, *above*] "to locate Jewishness in the moment of its encounter with the non-Jewish, in the dispersal of the self that follows from that encounter [mainly with Edward Said and Mahmoud Darwish]." (p 26)

Conclusions

Within Israel's left, Atzmon's ideas and formulations ruffle few feathers. As *Ha'aretz* journalist Yaron Frid says, lamenting Israel's loss of Atzmon, "The score, for now: 1-0, Palestine leading." In Israel Atzmon's mother commented, "[The book] is not at all anti-Semitic. Gilad has a problem with Jewishness, he talks about three categories of Jews, but you have to read everything to understand – rather than bring quotations and take them out of context... I am very proud of my son." (*ibid.*) But a mother would say that, wouldn't she?

Atzmon insists that the desire for a Jewish nation arises out of Jewish suffering's experienced specialness and asks what is then left of Jewish-ness when identification with (the uniqueness of) Jewish suffering is overcome. He asserts that Israel is not just another colonial power, but one driven by a distinctly Jewish ideology, and he convinced me that we must understand this Jewish-ness to understand for instance AIPAC, or to see that the West Bank to be given up by Israel in some phantasmagoric two-state settlement is not the West Bank, but *Judea and Samaria*. Yes, talking about a culture as opposed to some number of that culture's members holds risks of conflation and ambiguity, and some of Atzmon's discussion is an intra-Jewish one. But his book undoubtedly illuminates the 'prosemitic' racist ideology fatal to Palestinians. Perceptions differ, of course, but I do not see how anyone can read the whole book, with open ears, and find Atzmon 'antisemitic' or racist.

Granting's signatories write that they "stand with all and any movements that call for justice, human dignity, equality, and social, economic, cultural and political rights." I urge them to re-read (or read) *Wandering*, present a definition of 'antisemitic' racism, and based on textual evidence debate

whether Atzmon's words fulfill it. Because Jew-hatred has been so trivialised by Zionists, accusations of 'antisemitism' must be especially well-argued. For the ODS movement unity at any cost is not essential, but we need our energies to help transform Israel into a normal country respecting all humans' rights. Unless racism is proven, one should bury the hatchet.

Blake Alcott is an ecological economist living in Cambridge, England. He can be reached at: blakeley@bluewin.ch.

Citations

#

Original signatories of the first letter publicly denouncing Atzmon:

Not Quite "Ordinary Human Beings" -- Anti-Imperialism and the Anti-Humanist Rhetoric of Gilad Atzmon

As'ad AbuKhalil, *The Angry Arab News Service*, Turlock CA

Max Ajl, essayist, rabble-rouser, proprietor of *Jewbonics* blog site, Ithaca NY

Electa Arenal, professor emerita, CUNY Graduate Center/Hispanic & Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Women's Studies, New York NY

Gabriel Ash, International Jewish Anti-Zionist Network, Geneva, SWITZERLAND
Dan Berger, Wild Poppies Collective, Philadelphia PA

Lenni Brenner, author, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictator*, New York NY
Susie Day, *Monthly Review*, New York NY

Todd Eaton, Park Slope Food Coop Members for Boycott-Divestment-Sanctions, Brooklyn NY

S. EtShalom, Registered Nurse, Philadelphia PA

Sherna Berger Gluck, Prof. Emerita, California State University/Israel Divestment Campaign, CA

Andrew Griggs, Café Intifada, Los Angeles CA

Ken Hiebert, activist, Ladysmith, Canada
Elizabeth Horowitz, solidarity activist, New York NY

Karl Kersplebedeb, Left Wing Books, Montreal, CANADA


Mark Klein, activist, Toronto, CANADA
Mark Lance, Georgetown University/Institute for Anarchist Studies, Washington DC

David Landy, author, *Jewish Identity and Palestinian Rights: Diaspora Jewish Opposition to Israel*, Dublin, IRELAND

Bob Lederer, Pacifica/WBAI producer, Queers Against Israeli Apartheid, New York NY

Matthew Lyons, Three Way Fight, Philadelphia PA

Karen MacRae, solidarity activist, Toronto, CANADA
 Marvin Mandell and Betty Reid Mandell, co-editors, *New Politics*, West Roxbury MA
 Matt Meyer, Resistance in Brooklyn, New York NY
 Michael Novick, People Against Racist Terror/Anti-Racist Action, Los Angeles CA
 Sylvia Posadas (Jinjie), Kadaitcha.com, Don't Play Apartheid Israel, Noosa, AUSTRALIA
 Roland Rance, Jews Against Zionism, London, UK
 Liz Roberts, War Resisters League, New York NY
 Emma Rosenthal, contributor, *Shifting Sands: Jewish Women Confront the Israeli Occupation*, Los Angeles CA
 Ian Saville, performer and lecturer, London, UK
 Joel Schwartz, CSEA Local 446, AFSCME, New York NY

Simona Sharoni, SUNY, author, *Gender & the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, Plattsburgh NY
 Abraham Weizfeld, author, *The End of Zionism and the liberation of the Jewish People*, Montreal, CANADA
 Laura Whitehorn, former political prisoner, NYS Task Force on Political Prisoners, New York NY
 Ben White, author, *Palestinians in Israel: Segregation, Discrimination, and Democracy*, Cambridge, UK
Update on Saturday, February 2, 2013 at 07:39AM by  [Alison Weir](http://alisonweir.org/)
 Another interesting article, published in 2008, is [Freedom of Speech, Free Speech and Their Enemies: The Silencing of Gilad Atzmon](http://alisonweir.org/journal/2008/2/1/freedom-of-speech-free-speech-and-their-enemies-the-silencing-of-gilad-atzmon/), by Oren Ben-Dor.
 Ben-Dor grew up in the State of Israel and teaches political philosophy and the philosophy of law at the School of Law, University of Southampton, UK. He is the author of *Constitutional Limits and the Public Sphere* and *Thinking about*

Law: In Silence with Heidegger. He can be reached at okbendor@yahoo.com.
 In his lengthy essay, Ben-Dor writes: "It is the task of an intellectual to touch the untouchable and liberate thinking from its blackmailed, somewhere idle, comfort zones. I am firmly convinced that these vulgar attempts at silencing of Gilad and other courageous voices offends against supremely thoughtful, compassionate and egalitarian intellectual endeavours. This propaganda of silencing which is characterised by breeding conflict and heresy stalls a debate which is crucial for Palestine and for humanity." Article originally appeared on AlisonWeir.org <http://alisonweir.org/> See website for complete article licensing information.
<http://alisonweir.org/journal/2013/2/1/more-on-the-gilad-atzmon-controversy-and-why-it-matters.html?printerFriendly=true>

Canberra denies Zygier spilled Mossad info Attorney general says security services never met with agent, much less received secrets from him – the reported reason for his arrest by Israel

By [Joshua Davidovich](#) February 22, 2013, 6:59 am

Israeli-Australian Mossad agent Ben Zygier did not meet with members of Australia's internal security service, Canberra Attorney General Mark Dreyfus said Friday, denying reports the spy had been jailed for passing Israeli secrets to the ASIO. Zygier, known until recently as Prisoner X, hanged himself in a super-secure jail cell in Ayalon Prison in 2010. Last week, Australia's ABC television reported that Zygier, a Melbourne native who moved to Israel in 2000, was the mystery prisoner and earlier this week reported that Zygier had been arrested by Israel for passing information on Mossad use of Australian passports and on a Mossad operation to Australia's internal spy agency. Dreyfus's [spokesperson told the Sydney Morning Herald](#) that the

ABC report on why Zygier was arrested was incorrect. "As often happens in cases of this nature, speculative material has found its way into the public domain," she told the paper. The attorney general's office issued a statement after Dreyfus met with the ASIO head, backing up Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's statement earlier this week that Israeli and Australian intelligence agencies work together "with complete transparency." "The Attorney-General has been fully briefed by the director-general of ASIO on his agency's knowledge of this case," the statement read, "The director-general's account is entirely consistent with the recent statement issued by the Israeli Prime Minister." Israel has not commented on why Zygier was arrested, but said the

case needed to be kept under wraps for national security reasons. According to the ABC report, Zygier was jailed in early 2010 after the Israel feared he had passed information on a much-planned Mossad operation in Italy to the ASIO. Earlier this week former foreign minister Alexander Downer said Zygier's offense was likely much more serious. Australian Foreign Minister Bob Carr originally said Zygier's case had not been known to his office, but later flip-flopped and ordered an investigation into the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's handling of the case. Dreyfus said last week such an investigation was unnecessary. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/canberra-denies-zygier-passed-info-to-australia/>

Report: Pope's resignation linked to probe into 'Vatican gay officials'

La Repubblica says decided to quit after receiving report from three cardinals describing a number of factions, including one whose members were 'united by sexual orientation', Ynet, 22 February 2013.

A report has linked the resignation of [Pope Benedict XVI](#) to the discovery of a network of gay prelates in the Vatican, according to Italian newspaper La Repubblica. Some of the prelates, the report said, were being blackmailed by outsiders.

The pope's spokesman declined to confirm or deny the report.

According to La Repubblica, the pope had taken the decision that he was going to resign on 17 December– the day he received a dossier compiled by three cardinals who were tasked with looking into the so-called "Vatileaks" affair.

The newspaper noted that last May Pope Benedict's butler, Paolo Gabriele, was arrested and charged

with having stolen and leaked papal messages that portrayed the [Vatican](#) as a hotbed of intrigue and internal strife.

According to La Repubblica, the report, comprising "two volumes of almost 300 pages – bound in red" was transferred to a safe in the papal apartments and would be delivered to the pope's successor as soon as he is elected.

The newspaper said the cardinals described a number of factions, including one whose members were "united by sexual orientation."

La Repubblica said the report claimed some Vatican officials had been subject to "external influence" from laymen with whom they had links of a "worldly nature." The

paper said this was a clear reference to blackmail.

The Italian daily quoted a source "very close to those who wrote (the cardinal's report" as saying, "Everything revolves around the non-observance of the sixth and seventh commandments."

La Repubblica said the cardinals' report identified a series of meeting places in and around Rome, including a villa outside the Italian capital, a sauna in a Rome suburb, a beauty parlor in the city's center, and a former university residence that was in use by a provincial Italian archbishop.

<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4348165,00.html>

[...another B S story... as if materialism triumphed over idealism in National Socialist Germany! Had that been the case, then the persecution of Germans would have ceased at the end of World War Two. Instead, because the battle was/is over an idea that had no equivalent in the material world, i.e. as Carl Jung clearly recognized – a new religion was developing that threatened to eclipse all others, the continued persecution of Germans who want to be Germans must continue. Unfortunately the persecutors have forgotten that an idea cannot be killed off – and thus only the individuals who carry and express this idealism must be stopped from functioning! - ed. AI]

Hunt begins for legendary £1billion in Nazi gold

An Israeli investigator has begun a hunt for Nazi gold worth an estimated £1 billion which legend says was dumped in a lake near Berlin in the closing days of the Second World War.

By [Matthew Day](#), 5:12PM GMT 19 Feb 2013

Some 18 crates of gold and platinum may lie buried under the bed of the Stolpsee, a 988-acre stretch of water to the north of the German capital.

Yaron Svoray, who has the backing of German authorities, will use the latest sonar and radar equipment to try and locate the gold, which, the story goes, was dropped into the lake under the orders of Hermann Goering as the Red Army made its final push for Berlin in March, 1945.

One eyewitness, Eckhard Litz, told a post-war commission that he saw around 30 concentration camp prisoners unloading heavy crates from lorries parked by the Stolpsee. The boxes were then ferried into the middle of the lake, and thrown into its waters.

"When the last case had been thrown overboard, the men returned to shore, were lined up and the last thing I saw were the flashes of the machine guns of the guards as they were killed," recalled Mr Litz.

Mr Svoray, who has spent much of his life tracking anti-Semites and hunting for Nazi treasure, believes that the German in command of the operation later fled to South America.

His attempt to find the mysterious Stolpsee treasure is not the first. In the 1980s when the lake lay behind the Iron Curtain, the Stasi, East Germany's secret police, used combat divers to hunt for the gold, and two years ago a group of businessmen also tried to locate it.

The Nazis, and in particular Hermann Goering, amassed vast fortunes in treasure stolen from their victims, and this, said Mr Svoray, has provided him with another reason to find the gold.

"To me it is not just about the treasure, but also about the people who had it taken from them," he explained. "My goal is to finally earn them a bit of justice."

Related Articles

[*France to launch search for Jewish owners of plundered Nazi art](#) 19 Feb 2013

[*Amazon sacks 'neo-Nazi' security firm](#) 19 Feb 2013

Atrocities against the German people 1939-1945



Hamburg, August 1943



Kassel, Oktober 1943



Dresden



Hamburg, Juli 1943



Hamburg, Juli 1943



Dresden



Hamburg, Juli 1943



Berlin, Februar 1944



Dortmund, 7.10.1944



Unbekannter Ort